



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

it is psychologically *inconceivable* that Peter could have done what Paul *says that he did do*. Peter is thus relieved of his reputation for cowardice; but it is done at the expense of Paul's reputation for veracity. Probably we shall soon be told that the story of Peter's denial of Christ is fictitious. For the article under consideration lays stress on the importance of Peter's confession of Jesus' messiahship at Cæsarea Philippi; and it is intrinsically more improbable that a short time afterward Peter could have denied all knowledge of Jesus, than that he could have behaved as he is alleged to have done at Antioch. To be sure, the Christian world has, in general, never found any difficulty in believing the story of the denial, and has even found it to be quite in accordance with the working of imperfectly sanctified human nature in all generations; but that will not prevent its being discovered to be psychologically inconceivable that the story can be true. This argument from psychological inconceivability is a very convenient and effective one. I remember once hearing a German theological student emphatically affirm that it was psychologically inconceivable that the mother of Jesus could have had any other children to bring up. How much easier to settle that vexed question in this way than to bother with the various Marys and Jameses and reach no certain result after all!

And so at last it comes to this: All the various accessible witnesses to the facts of the history of the early Christian church are found to be untrustworthy. They agree with one another too much, or they disagree with one another too much; and in either case they come into collision with the psychological make-up of the critical scholar. Accordingly the only satisfactory way of getting at the facts of early Christian history seems to be to trust entirely to the intuitions of the modern seer.

C. M. MEAD.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

HISTORICAL CRITICISM OF JER. 1:4-19.

1. *Jeremiah's prophetic call, 1:4-10.*—The correctness of the date given both in 1:3 and 25:3 as the thirteenth year of Josiah, *i. e.*, 627-6 B. C., admits of no doubt and is challenged, as far as I know, by nobody. The purpose of the story of Jeremiah's call is the vindication of the prophet's divine authority. Just as Amos told the priest at Bethel that he had been sent directly by Yahweh, and that he did not by any means belong to the professional prophets, so Jeremiah narrates here that he has not sought the prophetic office for himself, but has been compelled

to it by Yahweh. It is manifest that it was necessary for the prophet to emphasize his divine mission and to show his credentials only at a time when he encountered opposition and enmity. We know that in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, *i. e.*, 604 B. C., the opposition against him had already set in. There was only one plausible reason and explanation which his opponents could give for their action against a prophet of Yahweh: that they doubted his divine mission and the genuineness of his prophethood. And they could be sure in Jeremiah's case that this explanation would be readily accepted, for so much was clear to the people: he who prophesied against the holy city, whose inviolability had become a dogma, uttered a blasphemy; he could not have been sent by Yahweh. So the people say in 26: 11. Though their judgment was changed in this instance by wise counsel, yet the doubt had been voiced, suspicion had been excited, and Jeremiah's imprisonment was possible only under the cover of this accusation. If under these circumstances the prophet wanted to procure for his word due respect and authority, he must write the story of his call. By Yahweh he is sent and His words he speaks. It would seem that the shameful treatment which the king gave to the first roll, by the burning of which he showed that he regarded these messages, not as divine oracles, but as the utterances of a traitor, must have given even more point to Jeremiah's desire to vindicate his prophethood. So that, while it is not improbable that he may have prefixed the account already to the first roll, it is perhaps more probable that he wrote it for the second. It might be possible that he prefixed it not until he had finished all his prophecies in 586 B. C. But it is to be remembered that at that time the authority of the prophet was immense. His prophecies had been fulfilled; he was indeed the prophet sent by Yahweh. It was absolutely unnecessary to refute any doubt concerning the genuineness of his prophethood; the events had spoken too plainly. It is therefore more natural to assume that he wrote it for the second roll in 604 B. C.

Now, on psychological grounds we must expect the story, written more than twenty years after it happened, to be tinged with the prophet's later experiences. And a careful examination of the narrative seems to reveal some of these later elements. In vs. 6 Jeremiah gave his youth as the reason for his shrinking back from the great office. He is backward and shy, too young and too little influential, therefore not qualified. That he was afraid the people might persecute him on account of his message, he does not say. In vs. 8, however, it is pre-

supposed that he was afraid of the consequences of his prophetic activity, for the assurance is given him that Yahweh will be with him and save him. Taken together with the fact that he has not yet been told what he should proclaim, so that he must be supposed to be still ignorant of the message, with the further fact that nothing is felt to be missing if vs. 8 be omitted, the connection in the story becoming apparently even more close, and with the fact that in this same chapter (vss. 18, 19) the same verse recurs almost verbatim, it might suggest the conclusion that vs. 8 should be omitted as a later element of the composition. But that would be too hasty, if we consider that with the call to be a נָבִיא, a "prophet," the message was essentially given to Jeremiah.¹ For the true prophet proclaims, according to Jeremiah, only disaster (*cf.* 28:8, 9; 5:12, 13); to become a prophet means to him to become a proclaimer of destruction. If this was clear to Jeremiah from the very beginning, it is not to be wondered at that he should have become afraid of the consequences of his prophesying, and that he needed even then the encouragement of Yahweh's presence in danger.

That the word "prophet" was pregnant with this meaning at the time when he wrote down this narrative is manifest, so that we need not regard vs. 8 as a later addition to our present text. But the question is appropriate whether "prophet" meant to Jeremiah "proclaimer of disaster" at the very beginning, and whether Jeremiah needed at this time already encouragement of this kind. It would seem more likely that in the course of his prophetic activity, when he saw that he proclaimed only destruction, while others proclaimed peace, he must have looked back on the past history of his people. There he found that the true prophets of Yahweh had always predicted disaster, and he received comfort from the thought that he, the prophet of woe, was in organic connection with them.

Before him stands at the moment of his call the greatness of the office of a prophet of Yahweh. His sensitive heart is altogether controlled by the feeling of shyness and backwardness. He shrinks back, but it is not fear for his life or the consequences of his prophesying. This is his experience at the time of his call. But later on, when he stood in the midst of opposition and persecution, the conviction is vouchsafed him by Yahweh that he is not alone in his fight for righteousness. Since he was executing His commission, he would experience His help. And now as he—in the very midst of persecution—

¹ For the etymology of נָבִיא see my "New Lexical and Critical Suggestions" in *American Journ. of Sem. Lang.*, January, 1902.

writes down the story of his call, he is convinced that this strong assurance of Yahweh's help had been given him at the very beginning. He reads his call in the light of his later experience. Vs. 8 was therefore written or dictated by Jeremiah in 604 B. C., but it is not an original element in his experience at the time of the call.

Another later element is probably contained in the last two words of vs. 10, *לְבִנּוֹת וְלִנְטוֹעַ*, "to build and to plant." We saw that Jeremiah regarded it as his commission to proclaim destruction, and his speeches show that he did not speak of restoration till many years later, *i. e.*, not before the time of the first deportation. But in these two words the constructive work is mentioned as forming an element of his task at the beginning. It looks as if this were also a trace of his later experience, and, moreover, not written by Jeremiah in 604, but inserted later on, either by Jeremiah or by Baruch, or by somebody who lived after him. If, however, a comparison with 18: 7-10 be allowed, where this verse receives a full commentary, we shall have to regard as this constructive work, not only the later predictions of hope and restoration, but also the moving calls to repentance with which he strives to save his people from ruin. It would then probably not be necessary to regard the words *לְבִנּוֹת וְלִנְטוֹעַ* as the expression of his later experience, though I cannot altogether free myself from the feeling that they are.

Does now, after these later elements are recognized, the remainder represent the contents of the original call?

It has been claimed recently by Duhm^a that the idea expressed in *לְגוֹיִם*, "for the nations," in vs. 5, and *עַל-הַגּוֹיִם וְעַל-הַמְּמַלְכוֹת*, "over the nations and over the kingdoms," in vs. 10, is altogether irreconcilable with the information given us by Jeremiah in the undisputed parts of his book, and it is mainly on this account that Duhm denies the authenticity of vss. 4-10.

Is this assertion justified, even if we grant that all the passages which Duhm rejects as later additions are really not from Jeremiah?

In deciding this point we must take into account, not simply the prophetic activity, but also the prophetic consciousness of Jeremiah. We have to consider at least the possibility that Jeremiah had the consciousness that he was indeed set by Yahweh over the nations and not only over his own people, even though he did work only for his own people. We know that Jeremiah regarded the true prophets as pro-

^a*Das Buch Jeremia* in "Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament," 1901.

claimers of disaster, not simply to their own people, but also to the nations. He emphasizes this point in 28:8, 9. Yet these prophecies were incidental with them; their real activity was for Israel and Judah. It is certainly of no little importance that Hosea, whom Jeremiah must have regarded as a true prophet, and whom he must have greatly admired, as is evidenced by the great influence of Hosea on the young prophet, dealt exclusively with his own people, and yet he falls under the category of the prophets described by Jeremiah in 28:8, 9. Can we deny that Jeremiah, just like others, saw his people standing in the midst of a great world-movement which affected, not only Judah, but all the neighboring nations? Are there not at least some traces in the undoubted passages which show that he had this view? (4:3 ff., 27.) Can we believe that Jeremiah, when he saw in his vision the terrible Scythian invasion breaking in from the north, should never have thought of the neighboring nations? Must we not rather suppose, even if he had not hinted at it in 4:3 ff., that he was conscious that by proclaiming the doom of his own nation he predicted also that of the others? Could he have regarded the march of Nebuchadnezzar as affecting merely Judah? Chap. 27 points to the contrary. Could he look at the pillaging and the shameful behavior of the neighbors after the destruction of Jerusalem without uttering a passionate word of prophetic retribution—and that after Yahweh had revealed to him that yet again houses and fields should be bought in the land? Surely he regarded the Chaldeans as divine instruments, but there is no trace of evidence that he thought this behavior of the neighbors belonged to the divine punishment.

Suppose that the only genuine passage concerning the hope for the future be in chap. 32, where by the business transaction it is made clear to him that "houses and fields and vineyards shall yet again be bought in this land." Are we here to think seriously that he believed the remaining population, the dregs of the nation, should increase again and thus become a new nation? Was this the new hope which Yahweh revealed to him? We must consider that he never speaks of a pious remnant; he prophesied utter destruction. But here at this time a new element of hope is introduced into his prophecies. There will be a restoration in times to come. Could he think of the good future as intended for anyone else but his own people? It was for this reason that he kept the contract so safe, that in years to come the people might know that he had proclaimed the restoration beforehand. But if Jeremiah saw a future restoration for his people, he must have consid-

ered also the fall of Babylon. It is difficult to see in what other way he could have regarded the restoration as possible except by the interposition of Yahweh and the overthrow of the Chaldean power. How far the idea of a peaceful return was from the thoughts of even the greatest minds is seen in Deutero-Isaiah.

In view of all this, it does not seem to be so improbable that Jeremiah regarded himself to be called a prophet "for the nations."

But even if this idea could be proved not to be by Jeremiah, the objection would hold good only to it and not to the whole story, if the obnoxious idea could be eliminated without destroying the whole narrative. think it can, if the **לְגוֹיִם**, "for the nations," in vs. 5, be changed into **לְעַמִּי**, "for my people," and vs. 10 be omitted as far as **דְּמַמְלָכוֹת**, "kingdoms."

That the whole story is not from Jeremiah is very difficult to believe, (1) in view of the difficulty of accounting for an invention of the call; (2) in view of the story's remarkably fine accord with Jeremiah's character; (3) in view of the singular conception of the extraordinary relation of the prophet to Yahweh, vs. 5; (4) in view of the peculiar excuse, "I am too young." It was, of course, not difficult to figure out that Jeremiah must have been a young man in 626, since he lived still in 586 B. C. But that such stress should have been laid on it is strange, especially since it is made use of nowhere else in the book. There breathes all through the story the spirit of Jeremiah, and it is difficult to deny its authenticity; and it will not do to take recourse to the supposition that the interpolator of the Persian era used Baruch's life of Jeremiah in regard to the undoubtedly original points in the narrative (Duhm).

It remains to consider the historicity of the narrated experience. It is not the question whether we think differently from Jeremiah of such an experience, regarding it as inward, and as the culmination of a long struggle, while he looks upon it as outward and the beginning of this struggle. The question is whether we can bring anything forward against the inner truth of this account. We cannot. It is so true to Jeremiah's nature that we feel this shy and sensitive young man would never have taken the initiative. He must have been called by Yahweh in a special revelation. He had seen in his life the guidance of Yahweh manifested in such a marvelous way, and had come to see it also in the life of his parents, that he became convinced that there must be a special divine meaning in it; it dawns on him that he has been selected by Yahweh for a great mission even before he was

formed in his mother's womb (vs. 5). Whether the character of this mission was then dimly felt—its greatness certainly was; whether it became fully clear to him at the time of his call, we cannot tell. But so much we can see, that an inner struggle must have preceded. Yahweh tries to persuade him, but he shrinks back; he brings forward excuses; but they are overcome. The struggle becomes more intense, until one day he finds himself overmastered; and in the intensity of his realization of the spiritual world, he is conscious that Yahweh has touched his lips; he knows that he has been consecrated to be his prophet. He must prophesy from now on, whether he will or not (*cf.* 20 : 7 ff.), and his message is to be a message of doom, doom for Judah and doom for the nations.

2. *The vision of the almond tree, vs. 11, 12.*—This vision has evidently the purpose to encourage the prophet. "Does it seem to you as if the predicted destruction takes very long in coming? Be of good cheer; I watch over my word and shall also fulfil it." The situation here is quite different from that of the prophetic call. There he is exhorted to begin his prophetic work, his shyness is to be overcome; here the doubt is met whether Yahweh will really perform his word. It is not likely that this vision occurred right at the beginning of his prophetic activity. For first of all he must have proclaimed the message without the expected effect. The threatened disaster has not come; Jeremiah becomes disappointed; he needs this comfort. The vision is probably best explained by placing it after the time of the Scythian invasion. Jeremiah had proclaimed that the awful thunderstorm would break over the city, but it had passed without doing any harm. His prophecy was not fulfilled. He is on the brink of despair, but Yahweh comforts him: his word will yet be fulfilled. And now in the fourth year of King Jehoiakim, after more than twenty years have passed, he writes down this vision in connection with the threatened prediction; he knows it will surely come to pass.

The reason for placing this vision immediately after his call is that he wants to make it at once clear to his people that he has a revelation from Yahweh that the word which he has proclaimed to them so long—apparently without success—must become true after all. He overcomes in this way the doubt of the people, who recognize only that as Yahweh's word which really comes to pass, and secures thus their attention.

There is hardly any reason for doubting its authenticity and historicity. The description of a later interpolator, especially of one who

was familiar with Ezekiel's and Zechariah's visions, would hardly have been so simple, so short, and so chaste. Not one word is superfluous; everything belongs to the matter, just as in Amos, chap. 8.

3. *The vision of the seething caldron, vs. 13-19.*—Destruction threatens from the north. Not a single people is thought of, but "all the tribes of the kingdoms" of the north will march at Yahweh's command against Judah and Jerusalem. It was seething terribly in the north, and it seemed as if all the nations would sweep southward toward Judah. That is the situation.

It fits in best at the time of the Scythian invasion. The expressions in vs. 15 must, however, not be pressed; a little poetical or prophetic liberty must be allowed to Jeremiah. Whether he really knew that it was only one nation which swept through Asia? Why should it not have appeared to the young man as if the whole north would break loose and march against Judah? Was the mistake, after all, so very great? There may, indeed, be reflected in this vision something of the great patriotism of the Jews. Jerusalem and Judah are important enough for all the northern nations to war against. Such sense of self-importance was never wanting in the small nation, and it was not altogether without reason. But if this element is present here, it does not enter into the consciousness of the prophet. He is overawed by the awful danger which threatens his people. I fail to see an eschatological element.

The prophet must have had this vision shortly after his call. Not only what has been said so far speaks for this, but also the reason given in vs. 16, the defection of the people from Yahweh and their idol- and image-worship. When the Chaldean invasion threatened, the stress was laid on moral sins. A slight hint that Jeremiah was still conscious of having received this vision shortly after his call is given in the expression, "And the word of Yahweh came to me a second time," although in this chapter the phrase, *וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֵלַי*, "and the word of Yahweh came to me," occurs here for the third time—4, 11, 13. Now, when the prophet wrote down this vision in the fourth year of Jehoia-kim, he does not mean the Scythians any more, but the Chaldeans. And here, I believe, is an indication of historic fidelity, that at a time when he knew that not all the nations of the north, but only the Babylonians, could be intended, the prophet says Yahweh had spoken to him at that time, "I will call all the tribes of the kingdoms of the north."

Looked at in this way, not only the contents of the vision become

clearer, but it is also seen how little force, on the whole, the argument against the authenticity of the verses has, which is based on the idea that the writer falls in these verses from the great world-wide standpoint of the prophetic call to the mere threatening of Judah (Duhm). It is true that only Judah is threatened, but the destruction is placed in the midst of a gigantic world-wide movement, all tribes of the kingdoms of the north being summoned to take active part in the tragedy.

In this vision we are first told explicitly what the contents of his message shall be. Well may Jeremiah's heart be filled with fear; he knows that he will make many enemies. But Yahweh encourages him. Whether the encouragement given in vss. 17-19 belongs to the original elements of the vision, or whether it is not rather the outcome of his long, bitter experiences, is the question. That it belongs to the composition dictated by Jeremiah in 604 can hardly be doubted. A certain element of this comfort may have been granted to him at the time when he had the vision. But could he at that time already anticipate the enmity and persecution of the kings of Judah, when we know that King Josiah could hardly have fought against him? He may have anticipated opposition, and encouragement may have consequently been granted him, but the verses here are tinged with his later experience, especially with that under King Jehoiakim.

JULIUS A. BEWER.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

THE EASTERN CREEDS AND THE OLD ROMAN SYMBOL.

THE problem under consideration is the relation of the various forms of the baptismal symbol in use in the eastern churches to that used in the Roman church in the middle of the fourth century. To proceed in a logical fashion, we must first consider our sources of information; secondly, the dates and mutual relations of those sources; and finally we may endeavor to ascertain the relation between the Roman symbol (hereafter to be designated as R) and the eastern creeds, together with such indications as we shall be able to gather of the route or routes of communication, if such existed.

SOURCES FOR THE INVESTIGATION.

The primary sources for our study are the documents printed in Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der Alten Kirche*, 3d ed. (Breslau, 1897), Nos. 123-45, together with Nos. 153-6. A few